

## **KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING**

*June 18 - 19, 2003*

*North Coast Inn*

*Arcata, California*

### ***FINAL MINUTES***

**June 18, 2003**

#### **Membership:**

California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry  
California Department of Fish and Game  
California In-River Sport Fishing Community  
Del Norte County  
Hoopa Valley Tribe  
Humboldt County  
Karuk Tribe  
Klamath County  
Klamath Tribes  
National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries)  
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Siskiyou County  
Trinity County  
US Department of Agriculture  
US Department of the Interior  
Yurok Tribe

#### **Represented by:**

Dave Bitts  
Neil Manji  
Vacant  
Chuck Blackburn  
Mike Orcutt (alternate)  
Jill Geist  
Ron Reed, Vice chair  
Not represented  
Not represented  
John Clancy (alternate)  
Keith Wilkinson  
Jim DePree (alternate)  
Not represented  
Peg Boland  
John Engbring, Chair  
Mike Belchik (alternate)

#### **Agendum 1. Convene and opening remarks**

John Engbring opened the meeting and introduced Ron Reed from the Karuk Tribe as the Vice Chair for this meeting. He noted the presence of several alternate members. He also noted that the Vice Chair for next meeting will be Steve West.

#### **Agendum 2. Introductions of Congressional staff in attendance**

Present was Liz Murgia from Congressman Thompson's office.

Ron Reed made a few opening remarks. He stated that he is a traditional fisherman and that he is honored to be here. His personal goal is to restore fish to the levels he recalls in his childhood. He expressed appreciation for the hard work that is occurring to restore the river. He noted the decline of species other than salmonids such as lamprey and smelt. He said that there is now another "recipe for a fish kill" developing this year and that the fish kill last year was a travesty for the Tribes. He commented on the difficulty in quantifying the "changes in lifestyle" imposed on people who use and depend on the river. He noted that he thought that this forum was the best opportunity available at this time for restoring the Lower Klamath River and that he was glad to be "at the table."

**Agendum 3. Business****a. Adoption of agenda**

Rich McIntyre requested to add an agendum regarding water storage in the Upper Basin. Alice Kilham was noted as not present for her portion of Agendum 9. Neil Manji said that Gayle Garman will present on Agendum 6. It was noted that John Clancey will present on Agendum 6c. Mike Belchik said he and Ronnie Pierce would present on Agendum 16. John Engbring added Agendum 3d, appointments to budget committee.

**Motion: Keith Wilkinson moved to approve the agenda, as amended.**

**Second: Jill Geist seconded the motion.**

**Motion passed: unanimously.**

**b. Status of appointment letters**

John Engbring went over the status of re-appointments of members to the Task Force. He noted that the requests for re-appointments were sent out last week.

**c. Possible requirement to reduce travel costs in 2005**

John Engbring noted that due to budget constraints, we are being asked to decrease travel expenses by 10% this year, and possibly in future years.

**d. Appointments to the Budget Committee**

John Engbring reported that appointees to the budget committee are: Joan Smith, Dave Bitts, Mike Orcutt, Neil Manji, Keith Wilkinson, and John Engbring (Chair). One meeting is planned per year and meetings are open to other Task Force members.

**Agendum 4. Discussion of new Charter language**

John Engbring reviewed the issues concerning the Charter (see Agendum 4 handout). He noted that the Charter expires after this upcoming October meeting and that the request to renew the Charter should be submitted now. John Engbring went over the new ethics language that FACA committees must include. There was discussion about whether "Conflict of Interest" is a better characterization of the language and that some members may wish to request changes to the language.

**Assignment: Yreka staff will submit the Charter with language recommended by Interior (see Agendum 4 handout) shortly after the meeting. If any Task Force member has comments on the ethics language, please forward them to Laurie Simons who will forward them to Interior.**

**Agendum 5. Brief review of last meeting actions/general correspondence/program update**

Laurie Simons reviewed the letters that were sent out since last meeting (see Agendum 5 handouts). Several letters were sent to the Department of the Interior and one was sent to the chairman of the National Research Council committee on the Klamath. Laurie Simons reviewed the motions from last meeting (see minutes from the February 2003 meeting). She also reviewed restoration projects funded by Fish and Wildlife Service in the Klamath Basin for fiscal year 2002 (see Agendum 5 handout). On June 19, 2003, John Engbring asked for corrections to the last meeting minutes and several corrections were noted.

**Motion: Keith Wilkinson moved to approve the minutes, as amended.**

**Second: Dave Bitts seconded the motion.**

**Motion passed: unanimously.**

#### **Agendum 6. Brief Updates and Announcements**

##### **a. Update on State coho recovery process**

Gayle Garman, of the California Department of Fish and Game, reported on the progress of the State's recovery process for coho. There are two teams. Gayle Newton heads the team that covers statewide issues; Craig Martz is the group leader for the Shasta and Scott River sub-basins. Garman noted that recommendations are currently being developed by these groups and that the Fish and Game Commission will review the recommendations, which are due in August.

##### **b. Update on Shasta-Scott Recovery Team**

Phil Detrich reported that the Shasta-Scott Recovery Team is a new pilot recovery effort designed to address the special agricultural issues in these basins. Meetings are occurring monthly and progress is available on the following website [www.cohorecovery.org](http://www.cohorecovery.org). Ron Reed voiced concern that Tribes are not members of the recovery team.

##### **c. Update on NOAA coho recovery planning**

John Clancy reported that NOAA's Technical Recovery Team was meeting that same day in Santa Cruz. He indicated that the team will finalize population number targets of coho populations by the end of the year.

##### **d. Status of lamprey species petition**

Phil Detrich reported that the Fish and Wildlife Service determination on the listing petition for lamprey species in the Klamath basin indicated that the various taxa do not warrant an emergency listing. Therefore, status review is anticipated to start when possible, probably in 2004.

#### **Agendum 7. Public Comment**

Ronnie Pierce, Klamath Inter-Tribal Fish and Water Commission, reviewed past history of low summer flows and fish kills in the Klamath River. She noted that Chinook juvenile fish kills are likely again this summer due to expected high air temperatures. She reviewed some preliminary data of juvenile Chinook deaths in the Klamath River occurring that week (see handout for Agendum 7). She asked that parties voice their concerns to the Bureau of Reclamation.

Dan Gale, fisheries biologist with Yurok Tribe, raised concerns about the lack of the Tribe's role on the Shasta-Scott coho Recovery Team. He also voiced concern over agricultural water issues being the main focus with perhaps less focus on other important issues in these sub-basins.

Felice Pace, Klamath Forest Alliance, voiced concern over politics of the State's coho recovery process. Specifically, he noted that the timber industry and others do not favor new rulings or action, but would rather see additional studies or assessments. He also noted that there has been a significant increase in irrigated acres in the Shasta and Scott basins over the past several decades. He questioned whether the process is legal because listing is being held up.

**Agendum 8. Relation between upslope land management and base flow presentations**

Presentations were made by two research hydrologists: Dr. Gordon Grant of the Forest Service Pacific Northwest Experiment Station and by Dr. Lee McDonald of Colorado State University.

Dr. Grant's presentation was entitled "Where does the water come from? New insights into the sources of Cascadian Rivers." He also provided a newsletter of the Pacific Northwest Research Station that profiled his work (see Agendum 8 handout).

Dr. Grant's presentation focused on the source of streamflow out of the Cascade Range of Oregon. He contrasted two different regions that produced different flow behavior. The "Old Cascades" are located in the western portion of the Cascades Range and are geologically older and more dissected (steep slopes). This area produces more "flashy" streamflow (higher stormflow) and lower summer baseflow. The "High Cascades," located in the eastern portion of the Cascade Range, is geologically younger, volcanic in origin, and not so dissected. This area has a greater proportion of deep seepage, with springs and gushers, and therefore has higher amounts of cold baseflow during summer. Streams that flow out of the Cascades are under the influences of these two different systems successively, and the cold and more constant summer flows from the High Cascades are an important element of water quality. The Klamath River basin has three styles of flow going downriver, a spring-fed type with high, cold summer flows, a snow melt peak in flows, and a winter peak in flows. Mike Belchik commented that this shows why spring Chinook are in trouble; they can't get to the important spring-fed areas due to the existence of dams.

Dr. McDonald's talk was entitled "Effects of forest management on runoff: principles and potential." Dr. McDonald reviewed research on streamflow as affected by forest management. He noted that studies show a wide range of effects of forest management and that many factors can influence the resultant hydrologic response. Therefore, simple generalizations are difficult regarding timing, peakflows, and baseflows. In general, forest harvests increase runoff on an annual basis and greater proportional yields occur with increasing rainfall. Most increases with harvests occur during peakflow, but harvesting can also increase baseflow. Increases to baseflow do not last long (past canopy closure) and increases are diminished in drier areas. He noted that in areas of less than 18 inches of annual precipitation, increases in water yield are not detectable. He also noted that it would be difficult to detect increases in water yield due to management over a large landscape area.

**Agendum 9. Report from Klamath Watershed Coordination Group****a. Upper Klamath Basin Working Group**

Jim Carpenter reported that their group has been meeting monthly on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Thursday of each month. They are anticipating receiving the 25% match for their watershed assessment. A request for proposals will soon be issued for aid in preparing the assessment. The Working Group is also organizing a 2-day tour of the upper basin and extends invitations to members of the lower basin. The tour would include the Barnes Ranch acquisition and other projects. The tour would likely be the 3<sup>rd</sup> week of July. Their website is [www.fs.fed.us/r6/winema/ukbwg](http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/winema/ukbwg) or also see [Klamathgroups.org](http://Klamathgroups.org). January of 2004 is the planned date for the Klamath basin conference to be held at the Oregon Institute of Technology in Klamath Falls; they are looking for funds and lower basin people to help with coordination.

He expressed concern for the lack of progress on greater basin-wide coordination. He stressed the need for greater networking and communication. He thinks conditions are as bad as they have ever been regarding upper and lower basin coordination and cooperation, though the high rainfall received in April has made this less apparent.

**b. Trinity Management Council**

Mike Orcutt reviewed the history and progress of the past and pending judgments pertaining to the Record of Decision on the restoration of the Trinity River. Mike Orcutt introduced Doug Schleusner, the executive director of the Trinity River Restoration Program. John Engbring said that he and Doug Schleusner are working on a date that the Task Force can meet with the Trinity Management Council.

Doug Schleusner described the organization of the Trinity River Restoration Program and some of its activities (see Agendum 9 handout). He noted several administrative arms of the program: Trinity Management Council (policy/advisory composed of stakeholders), Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (federal advisory group), Science Advisory Board (5 independent scientists), and the Weaverville office with sections in science and engineering. Their current focus is to take care of private bridges that currently limit peak flows.

**Agendum 10. Planning for 2003 Klamath Project Operations and status of the Conservation Implementation Program**

Cecil Leslie of the Klamath Falls Bureau of Reclamation described augmented flow from a 50,000 acre-foot water bank in the upper Klamath basin (see Agendum 10 handouts). An additional 10,000 acre-feet may be available for release after July.

Chuck Blackburn expressed the need for more data describing the flows on various parts of the river. Dave Bitts asked about availability of reports of the National Research Council and Dr. Hardy. Cecil Leslie did not know about timing of these reports. Mike Belchik asked why Rangeland Trust water was not included as part of the flow augmentation. Leslie replied that this 12,000 acre-feet of water was purchased for a variety of purposes.

Christine Karas, Deputy Area Manager, Klamath Falls Bureau of Reclamation passed out the draft of the Klamath River basin Conservation Implementation Program (CIP) (see Agendum 10 handouts). She reported that this type of program has been used in other basins with success. The CIP was proposed in order to remove jeopardy, to recover the three listed fish species, and to provide for continued water use and development. This is the first issue of a draft document and Christine Karas invited comments. She also mentioned that the Bureau of Reclamation has some seed money to start the process, but funding has yet to be worked out. She saw the CIP as a parallel process to the Klamath Task Force and other groups. The focus of the CIP will be beyond the operations of the Klamath Project.

Mike Belchik stated that one concern of the Tribe's is that the CIP is fundamentally different from the Task Force. The CIP does not focus on all species of anadromous fish but will first focus on listed fish species. Ms. Karas replied that the CIP should be a help to the Task Force and not represent a paradigm shift. She also reiterated the successful recovery of several fish species in the upper Colorado River using this process.

Jill Geist raised a concern that the CIP may result in fracturing current efforts and will take resources away from efforts such as the Task Force. The Task Force then took time to continue discussion about the Bureau of Reclamation's plan for the Conservation Implementation Program.

The Task Force continued this discussion the next day. Mike Belchik wanted to state the Yurok's concerns about the Bureau of Reclamation's CIP. The focus of the CIP is on endangered species and not on all of the anadromous fish species.

Other concerns that were raised included:

- the CIP is a potential duplication of purpose and effort,
- funding,
- failure to include local stakeholders,
- already numerous agencies existing to address endangered species,
- the apparent top down approach, and
- requirements for added meetings.

Jim DePree and Scott Quinn stated their reluctance to support the CIP. The CIP is a requirement of the NOAA Biological Opinion. One issue is that it focuses on recovery of the coho only. It may expand to restoration of the entire ecosystem in the future. It is not known what may eventually be the governing body. The future of the Task Force, and whether it will continue beyond 2006, is unknown.

Jill Geist wondered whether the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration had intended to create a parallel program. She thought the CIP proposal seemed to run counter to what Sue Ellen Wooldridge had verbalized during her previous visit (e.g., local involvement in solutions). Mike Belchik thought the Task Force should be proactive in promoting the CIP program shift from a species restoration approach to a more broad ecosystem approach.

**Motion: Mike Belchik moved that the Task Force draft a letter that conveys Task Force concerns of redundancy and focus of the Bureau of Reclamation's Conservation Implementation Program. He cited the following concerns:**

- **Funding is scarce, parallel programs are not efficient,**
- **it would be more efficient to use existing resources and groups that already have a structure set up (i.e., Task Force, Upper Klamath Basin Working Group, Trinity Management Council, Klamath Coordination Group, Klamath Compact),**
- **there should be a greater involvement of local stakeholders in such a process, and**
- **the program places too much focus on single species recovery and not enough on ecosystem recovery.**

**This letter will be reviewed by members before sending. It was clarified that the Federal agencies had the option to not be signatory to this letter if they felt they could not support it after their review.**

**Second: Jill Geist seconded the motion.**

Phil Detrich suggested that this concern be also tied back to the original legislative purpose of the Task Force. In addition, the tone of the letter should not show lack of support for restoration of the coho. John Clancy voiced his concern that his agency may not support a letter that contradicts something the agency had already agreed to in the Biological Opinion. It was clarified that the Federal agencies had the option to not sign this letter if they felt they could not support it after their review.

**Motion passed: unanimously.**

**Agendum 11. Suggestion that the Task Force consider promoting specific projects and coordinate all projects in the basin**

- a. Should the Task Force perform a similar assessment and proposal of projects as that performed in the Sacramento basin with the 1086 plan?**

Dave Bitts reported on the Sacramento plan where they performed a review of their basin and created a list of 20 high priority projects to address problems and their costs (see Agendum 11 handout). The projects were all "on-the-ground" restoration projects, and have been completed. Dave Bitts pointed out that the Task Force

has never done this. He wanted to pose the question as to whether the Task Force should perform a similar task. One product the Task Force would produce is a guidance document to give proposers a notion of what the Task Force wants done.

This issue was discussed again, the next day, following Agendum 16. At that time, an assignment was made to add this as an agendum at the next meeting.

**b. Should the Task Force coordinate all projects in the basin?**

Dave Bitts commented on the lack of an “over-all entity” that oversees projects in the basin. He went on to note the various efforts in the basin, but asked how does it all fit together? He proposed that projects be funded through the Task Force and that this may require a funded staff position.

This issue was also discussed following Agendum 16. At that time, an assignment was made to add this as an agendum for the next meeting.

**Assignment: In the agenda for the next meeting, staff will include a discussion of whether the Technical Work Group should perform an assessment of projects similar to that performed in the Sacramento basin (agendum 11 handout, 1086 plan). Dave Bitts said he would prepare a proposal and send it to the Task Force members two weeks prior to the next meeting.**

**Agendum 12. Report from Technical Work Group**

**a. Update of Task Force assignments**

Peter Brucker reported on activities of the Technical Work Group. He recapped Klamath River mainstem sub-basin planning issues and activities (see Agendum 12a handout). Peter Brucker asked if the Task Force would like to promote development of a sub-basin plan for the mainstem. Some members thought it was a good idea. Different ways it could get done were discussed, such as asking the Technical Work Group and sub-basin coordinators to discuss it. The Task Force will continue to think about this.

A database listing the funded projects has been proposed. This would contribute to the ability to perform effectiveness monitoring of restoration projects. The Spring Chinook Working Group is continuing their work on the identifications of limiting factors. He announced the annual spring Chinook dive survey that is scheduled to occur the 3<sup>rd</sup> week of July.

Mr. Brucker discussed a 12-page Accomplishments Summary that he is asking the sub-basins to help develop. When completed, it will be distributed to the public to show what has been accomplished through the program.

**b. Recommendations to the Task Force**

There was discussion about PacifiCorp’s Federal Energy Regulatory Commission relicensing application. There were concerns regarding the adequacy of studies being performed and the information being included as part of the scientific review. The following assignment was made:

**Assignment: The Technical Work Group will draft a comment letter on the adequacy of studies and the Draft Application for Klamath Hydroelectric Project relicensing, due in September. The letter will be circulated to Task Force members for approval.**

Another issue that was discussed was whether to send the draft letter to California Department of Fish and Game. There is concern that continued support for the Chinook yearling program at Iron Gate Hatchery is in jeopardy. The releases of fall Chinook yearling fish have higher survival than fingerlings. Also, yearlings from the hatchery marked with coded-wire tags will allow assessment of their survival compared to Fall Creek yearlings (see Agendum 12b handout).

The Technical Work Group expressed an interest in reviewing California Department of Fish and Game restoration proposals in the Klamath basin. However, it was too late to work out a process for getting this done.

**c. Coordination of fish mortality monitoring for 2003**

Peter Brucker reported that the Technical Work Group believes that greater coordination on fish kill monitoring is needed. He cited the needs for an overall fish mortality monitoring plan and an emergency response plan.

**d. 2004 project ranking and Work Plan recommendations**

Peter Brucker reported that the Technical Work Group ranked the proposals for 2004 funding (see Agendum 12d handout). They recommend for funding the category 1 projects listed down to HR-04, category 2 down to PC-02, category 3 down to FP-07 and include FP-13. Other projects they would like to fund include FP-02, FP-06 and E-04.

**Agendum 13. Report from Budget Committee on proposed 2004 Work Plan**

The Budget Committee met the prior evening to discuss the ranked proposals. They support the Technical Work Group proposal with the understanding that they might want to move some of the funding from a funded project to fund the 3 projects the Technical Work Group would like to fund.

**Agendum 14. Public comment**

Felice Pace, Klamath Forest Alliance, commented that the Conservation Implementation Program in the upper Colorado basin originated by a different process, that is, it was mandated by legislation. He noted that the Natural Resource Conservation Service is spending \$7 million on upgrades to irrigation upgrades in the Klamath basin. He further noted that a 1958 US Geological Survey report on Scott River states that 17,000 acres was irrigated; and this had increased to 32,000 acres by 1992. Dollars are being spent in the Scott on capital improvements to irrigation that may have little benefits to the system. He noted that there appears to be a duplication of funding by agencies for sub-basin planning for some of the basins. He finally noted that the Klamath basin made the cover of several magazines such as Mother Jones, Audubon, and Outdoor.

Jim Henderson, Karuk Tribe, reported that the fish kill that Ronnie Pierce reported earlier today was only for fish recovered in the screw trap. Therefore, the actual kill numbers in the river may be much larger.

**June 19, 2003**

John Engbring reconvened the meeting. Before resuming the agenda, the Task Force discussed the need for more stable funding for monitoring studies in the lower basin. John Engbring made the following assignment:



**Assignment: The Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office staff will draft a letter to the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior stressing the importance of “downstream” studies and asking for support of such studies. The draft will be sent to Task Force members for comment and approval.**

**Public comment: Barnes Ranch Project**

John Engbring then invited Rich McIntyre of the American Lands Conservancy and Upper Klamath Basin Work Group to speak. Rich McIntyre thanked the Task Force for their letter of support and provided an update on the Barnes Ranch Project. He reported that Representative Wyden supports the project, but Representative Walden doesn't support the project; he feels it may not fit in with other water storage plans. This lack of full congressional support threatens the project.

Mr. McIntyre clarified some of the issues of the Barnes Ranch Project: acquisition is 2,894 acres; it should help to provide storage of 53,000 acre feet (Barnes plus Agency Lake Ranch); it is estimated to be a \$182 per acre-foot, one-time cost (cost of Barnes divided by the total new acre feet gained by the acquisition--\$9.1 million); the Bureau of Reclamation is currently paying \$75 to 148 per acre-foot for water leasing. A concern with the project is that the lake would not fill in extra dry years. Chuck Blackburn asked if there are any other options for increasing water storage and Mr. McIntyre said none are available before 10 years from now.

**Agendum 15. Report from the Klamath Fishery Management Council**

Dave Bitts and Keith Wilkinson reported that the KFMC drafted a letter to PacifiCorp supporting fractional marking of hatchery fish at Iron Gate Hatchery so the efficiency and effects of the hatchery program can be assessed. Mike Orcutt remarked that the KFMC is using more sophisticated predictive models now and can use the information that would be provided. Keith Wilkinson said the KOHM is a product of KFMC solely and it is now building with refinements each year.

**Agendum 16. Task Force review of recommendations from Mid-term Evaluation Oversight Committee**

Ronnie Pierce first gave background on the review and evaluation process of the Task Force program (see Agendum 16 handouts). Ronnie Pierce noted that Kier and Associates made recommendations to the program and the Long Term Plan and produced a document “Mid-term Evaluation.” A sub-committee of the Task Force reviewed the Kier report and produced a list of recommended actions based on the Mid-term Evaluation in 1999. Several recommendations have been approved by the Task Force during the course of the past meetings over the last three years. Ms. Pierce requested that the Task Force discuss the list and take actions on the remaining items. However, it was apparent this would not be enough time to handle the discussion during this current meeting. Some of the issues that needed discussion included:

1. Should we reformat the Long Range Plan so it is more amenable to tracking (i.e., in an Access database that would list dollars spent-- see page 3-38 of the Mid-term Evaluation).
2. The Plan should be submitted to the FERC process.
3. There has been no effort to update the Plan.

**Assignment: Staff will set aside at least a half day at the next meeting to complete review of recommendations from Mid-term Evaluation. All members need to commit to go through the Mid-term Evaluation and the handouts from the Oversight Committee (see Agendum 16 handouts). Task Force members should be prepared to deal with the remaining recommendations from the Oversight Committee handout, and to decide what action to take on these recommendations.**

Keith Wilkinson said that many will not reread these documents and the Task Force may not follow the recommendations. He noted that since the Task Force has found it difficult to make the time to review these remaining items, they should just focus on these remaining items instead of revisiting the entire documents. John Engbring thanked Ronnie Pierce for continuing to work on this.

**Agendum 17. Report from Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office on Flow Study and other field studies**

George Guillen, Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office, reported on recent surveys of juvenile Chinook mortality. He noted that three days ago, the screw trap results from Big Bar indicated that 97 of the 137 trapped juvenile Chinook were dead and 13 of the live juvenile had evidence of disease. He noted that it is difficult to extrapolate these numbers to the river in terms of actual extent of the disease so far, but it is of concern. He noted that there seems to be a high mortality rate due to disease this year. The diseases (*Ceratomyxa shasta* or *columnaris*) are not well understood, but it is known that *Ceratomyxa shasta*, a protozoan, is dependent upon an intermediate host (a polychaete worm). The polychaete worm is not common in fresh water, but seems to prefer slower velocity waters such as along the margin of the stream. High temperatures also promote susceptibility by fish. He noted that 100% of live carts above Beaver Creek (fish put into a cage in the river) became infected with *Ceratomyxa shasta*.

George Guillen also noted that lower rates of juvenile capture are occurring so far. The majority of natural fish may be delayed by cooler water temperatures and higher flows. Indications are that out migration numbers are low.

Some discussion occurred on whether the agencies can do more to prevent future fish die-offs should the Task Force emphasize increasing flows to minimize juvenile fish mortality. Neil Manji asked what scientific proof exists that increased flow will reduce fish mortality. Mike Belchik said that conditions are like last year, which had a juvenile fish kill. Jill Geist said we can't wait for science, what adaptive strategy can we do? Chuck Blackburn thought it makes sense to release more water to help fish during downstream migration and coordinate this with hatchery releases.

**Agendum 18. Reports from Sub-basin Coordinators on the status of sub-basin planning, coordination, and restoration efforts**

**a. Lower Klamath Sub-basin**

Bob Rohde, Yurok Tribe, presented a review of the Lower Klamath sub-basin which includes the tributaries of the Klamath River downstream of the Trinity River Confluence to the mouth. He said that a main cause of impaired habitat in the Lower Klamath is excess sedimentation from upslope sources. A partnership between the Yurok Tribe, Simpson Timber Company, the California Coastal Conservancy, and the Northern California Indian Development Council has been formed to address restoration and plans have been prepared. He noted that \$5 million dollars has been spent on watershed assessments and projects; six watershed assessments have been performed since 1996; water quality monitoring stations are located below restoration sites; fish monitoring is also carried out. Coordination occurs with Simpson Timber Company, a large industrial forest landowner. He also noted that Simpson Timber Company has been working on their Habitat Conservation Plan for several years and are currently responding to comments from the recent public review. Mr. Rohde thanked the Task Force and the Fish and Wildlife Service for their support over the years.

**b. Scott River Sub-basin**

Rhonda Muse, Scott River Watershed Council, gave a presentation on the Scott River sub-basin. Two major issues are that the Scott River is listed as impaired for sediment and temperature under section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act and that the Scott River has threatened coho salmon. She said that the Council has committees on fish, land, monitoring, outreach, and water and there is also an executive committee and a technical committee. Several plans have been prepared including a strategic action plan that will be out for

peer review in October or November. This document is being coordinated with recommendations coming out of the Shasta-Scott Recovery Team for coho. Completed projects were reviewed, these included fish screens, riparian fencing and tree planting, channel enhancement, and surveys. Plans for future projects include water balance model, water quality monitoring, and spawning surveys.

**c. Shasta River Sub-basin**

Dave Webb, Shasta River Coordinated Resource Management and Planning (CRMP) coordinator, thanked the Task Force for their support. Mr. Webb said the Shasta River CRMP was the first sub-basin group to form in response to the Task Force's Long Range Plan in 1991. This group never would have formed without Task Force support and this support is continuing to be important. Mr. Webb went on to review activities of the Shasta River CRMP (see Agendum 18c handout). Mr. Webb noted that Dr. Mike Deas is working on a water quality model for the Shasta River and will make a presentation in Yreka on July 7 at 6-9 pm. He also noted that coordination has been ongoing with the Yreka Greenway Committee and that work has focused a wide variety of topics including remediation of flashboard diversion dams, promoting community involvement with state coho listing, facilitating the formation of the local recovery team, coordination with various groups includes government agencies, private organizations, and local businesses, and promotion of others to seek funding for studies.

**d. Salmon River Sub-basin**

Peter Brucker, Salmon River Restoration Council, reviewed their Action Plan (see Agendum 18d handouts). He described examples of the Council's programs including monitoring, fire planning, noxious weed eradication, road assessments, education programs in the schools, fish monitoring, temperature, and flow monitoring. He also provided handouts that the Council had prepared on each of these issues.

**e. Mid-Klamath Sub-basin**

Jim Henderson, Karuk Tribal biologist and member of Mid-Klamath Watershed Council, reviewed activities of the Karuk Tribe such as water quality monitoring, (D.O., pH, temperature), fish passage, fish studies (sturgeon and radio tracking of spring Chinook, lamprey), and educational and outreach projects. Mr. Henderson gave a presentation on the Mid-Klamath Watershed Council and passed out their

newsletter (see Agendum 18e handout). He reviewed the mission statement on watershed restoration, cooperation, and economic development. He also showed slides of some of their activities (willow planting, fire planning, and surveys for invasive plants). The Council has a website [klamathcommunity.org/mkwc](http://klamathcommunity.org/mkwc).

**Agendum 19. Public Comment**

Felice Pace, Klamath Forest Alliance, commented that water leasing in general is not a good deal. It is too expensive and not sustainable. The upper basin water bank is an example of this. He noted that it may be a good idea as an interim measure. He also stated his support for Dave Bitts' idea of the strategic work plan for the Task Force and suggested that the Technical Work Group send out a list of priorities for this year. He reiterated Neil Manji's point that the burden of proof should not be placed with species protection. He noted that the National Academy of Science review of the Endangered Species Act rejected placing the burden of proof on the species, which is similar to Gordon Orians' recommendation coined the "Precautionary Principle." He noted that the current administration goes against these recommendations and places the burden of proof on the species. On sub-basins, he noted that progress looks good. Road decommissioning in the lower basin has been successful, but more road decommissioning is needed in the Scott. He urged that we be careful with ground water pumping. With regard to the potential mainstem sub-basin plan he felt that it may be worth it to bring together existing data to aid political processes and for future restoration efforts. He recommended that the Task Force take a look at the changes being proposed for the USFS and BLM Aquatic

Conservation Strategy.

Andy Colonna, a private citizen who worked with the Task Force in the past, pointed out some important issues regarding fish population models. He showed graphs of fish numbers and timber production over time and suggested inverse relationships between the two. He noted several useful sites on the Internet by searching key words "Klamath River." He noted the need to be aware of duplication of efforts and what activities are occurring in the upper basin. He suggested Task Force and Klamath Fishery Management Council meetings be scheduled in August to better deal with a potential fish kill that now appears more likely to occur early this fall. He next read excerpts from President Ronald Reagan's statements on the Trinity Restoration Act of 1984 and the Klamath Restoration Act of 1986 regarding the need for conservation of resources. Mr. Colonna questioned whether this should be revisited with respect to some of the current administration's activities.

Pat Higgins, of the KRIS project, wished to announce the release of the KRIS 3.0 for review. Mr. Higgins can be contacted at 707-822-9428 or [phiggins@humboldt1.com](mailto:phiggins@humboldt1.com).

#### **Agendum 20. Task Force Decision on 2004 Work Plan**

The Task Force discussed the funding recommendations of the Technical Work Group and Budget Committee and decided on the following motion.

**Motion: Keith Wilkinson moved to accept the work plan as proposed by the Technical Work Group and Budget Committee. Referring to the ranked list of projects, the proposal is to fund all Category 1 projects down to and including**

**HR-04, fund all Category 2 projects down to and including PC-02, and fund all Category 3 projects down to and including FP-07 and include FP-13, for a total of \$578,130. Mike Belchik made a friendly amendment to take \$25,000 from the Big Bar Screw Trap, FP-04, and give \$10,000 to FP-02, \$10,000 to FP-06, and \$5,000 to E-04. This was conditional that the amount taken from Big Bar Screw Trap can be replaced with another funding source by October 23, 2003.**

**Second: Dave Bitts seconded the motion.**

**Motion passed: unanimously.**

#### **Agendum 21. Recap and summary of assignments and motions. Identify agenda to include in the next meeting.**

John Engbring announced that assignments and motions from this meeting will be provided to members by e-mail within 10 days of this meeting.

#### **Agendum 22. Next meeting is in Yreka, October 22-23, 2003. We need to schedule the February, June, and October meetings in 2004.**

Next year meetings were scheduled as: February 18-19 in Brookings, June 23-24 in Klamath Falls, and October 13-14 in Yreka.

Adjourn